

DRAFT

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
GILBERT, AZ
JUNE 7, 2017**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Chairman Kristofer Sippel
Vice Chairman Brian Andersen (arrived at 5:04 p.m.)
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield
Commissioner David Cavenue
Commissioner Greg Froehlich (joined the Commission on
the dais at 5:27 p.m. after the first agenda item was
discussed)
Commissioner Brian Johns (arrived at 5:20 p.m.)
Commissioner Joshua Oehler
Alternate Commissioner Mary Harris (in attendance, but
did not participate in discussion)

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Alternate Commissioner Seth Banda

STAFF PRESENT:

Bob Caravona, Senior Planner
Ashlee MacDonald, Planner II
Nichole McCarty, Planner II
Gilbert Olgin, Planner II
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Planning Manager Linda Edwards

ALSO PRESENT:

Attorney Nancy Davidson
Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson
Recorder Debbie Frazey

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kristofer Sippel called the June 7 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:02 p.m.

1. ST17-1002, MARATHON RANCH: FOUR NEW STANDARD PLANS (PLANS 6531, 6541, 7041 AND 7051) BY MARACAY HOMES ON 63 LOTS (LOTS 1-63), GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF 156TH STREET AND RIGGS ROAD AND ZONED SINGLE FAMILY - 10 (SF-10) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Senior Planner Amy Temes began her presentation by telling the Planning Commission that she was filling in for Nathan Williams on ST17-1002. Planner Temes shared that the project was Marathon Ranch by Maracay Homes. She stated the proposed project was located at Puri Farms. Puri Farms was approved back in 2014 for a General Plan and Rezoning and then it was approved for Preliminary Plat and Open Space in 2015. It is in a Single Family – 10 (SF-10) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. She noted that they are oversized lots of 12,600 square foot minimum. This development was allowed to be two-story, but all the standard plans have come in as one-story homes. She shared that the applicant is meeting their setback requirements. She said that she would like input from the Commission on architectural features, massing, articulation of roof lines and related architectural styles, and colors and materials.

Planner Temes shared a Front Elevation Matrix which indicated the four different styles of architecture: Spanish, Ranch Hacienda, Desert Prairie and Farmhouse. She shared the floor plans, noting that there are four different offerings in each of the four different architectural styles. She pointed out that the homes range in size from 3,443 to 4,409 square feet. She also shared a Rear Elevation Matrix, specifically noting that she would like input from the Commission on the rear elevations. She shared that the backs of the houses tend to be very flat and didn't have a lot of massing articulation occurring. She wanted input on how they might articulate the rear elevations a little more. She said the rear elevations will be seen by the general public. She shared Plan 6531, Plan 6541, Plan 7041 and Plan 7051. She pointed out a list of typical architectural attributes that are normally found in this style of architecture. She stated that Staff would not expect all the features listed to be on a home, but they would expect some of the features to be included. She noted that she had highlighted in orange the elevations that Staff felt were fairly well articulated. She mentioned the possibility of adding some authentic architectural features and building elements for each architectural type. She said that the rear patios were very small and seemed lost in the design due to their small size. Planner Temes indicated that the colors and materials board was on the dais, noting that Planner Williams had asked that she provide the color board with the actual color chips because the electronic rendering did not do a good job of showing the actual color. She mentioned that Staff feels that several of the colors, (specifically mentioning five colors) looked very similar. She said these represent main body colors and are basically the same tonal group and color. Planner Temes also indicated that Planner Williams had asked that this be corrected. She also noted some other colors with similarities and pointed out that this resulted in the palette not breaking up well because the body colors were so similar. She said that Planner Williams was concerned that there wasn't enough diversity in the colors, so she provided the color chips for the Commission to review, so they could offer feedback. Planner Temes finished her presentation.

Chair Sippel thanked Amy Temes for her presentation and called for questions or comments.

Comment: Joshua Oehler indicated that he agreed 100% with many of the suggestions that Planner Temes had made. He said that he thought the rear elevations definitely needed more articulation, noting that the way they are currently designed is too flat. He specifically mentioned Hacienda B, noting that the Hacienda B design had been done very well. He pointed out the shadow line, noting that it doesn't come out too much, but it breaks up the larger mass and the patio also has a little bit of movement, creating the shadow line. He noted that the Hacienda B design didn't just have a big flat wall with some windows in the back, as many of the other designs had. He indicated that the applicant had done a good job on this design, but had not done as good a job on many of the other elevations, noting that they only had a flat wall and some pop-out windows. He thought they should use the Hacienda B as an example of getting more movement in the rear. He then discussed Farmhouse "D" and indicated that it had an odd slope. He stated that he wasn't personally a fan of the design, but said the slope did give the design some interest. He mentioned that he wouldn't go so far as to say they should get rid of it, but he suggested that they redo it in a different direction. He stated that he didn't personally like the shallow roof tacked onto the side, but did prefer it over having nothing there, because it did create some interest. Regarding the colors, he agreed that when you do a quick look through, the colors all look the same. He suggested they get some more movement in the variation of colors. He also suggested some difference in materials, indicating that the tiles were also in the same category.

Comment: David Cavenee stated that the first thing that jumps out at him, is that these are large homes on large lots, so he thinks they need to have a commensurate look and they shouldn't look like starter homes. He shared that he likes the front elevations and had no challenge with those. He revealed that he had some concerns with the rear and sides. He stated that he noticed that the laundry room and garage doors were not shown on the elevations, which made him wonder if those were optional. He indicated that he thought that would increase the articulation a little bit if those doors were shown. He said he thought they should add some additional architectural interest on some of the rear and side elevations, especially because these are nicer homes. He pointed out that he thought Planner Temes had done some very good homework on the elements of each of the styles. He thought it would be a good idea for the applicant to incorporate a couple of the suggestions that Planner Temes had mentioned were usually typical of those particular architectural styles, into each of the elevations. He said the only rooflines that troubled him were the Desert Prairie and the Spanish from the rear. He stated that they appeared so plain from the rear. He suggested they do something to add additional interest. He stated that the Farmhouse and the Ranch Hacienda were reasonably well done. Regarding colors, he indicated that he liked the earth tone colors, so he likes where the applicant is headed. He noted that he didn't mind the transition from scheme to scheme, but internally he shared that 12 and 13 seemed to be almost the same color from Accent 1 to Accent 2 to Accent 3 and then there was one bold color. This resulted in three or four almost the same and then one much bolder color. Those are the only ones that he was specifically concerned about. He stated that when you look at the home, it is going to look very bland. In terms of overall scope, he likes the earth tones. He said he thinks they are different enough, given the earth tone palettes that they have, to create a nice subdivision.

Comment: Vice Chair Brian Andersen pointed out that he found the colors acceptable, given the fact that there are 16 palettes. He said 16 palettes is a lot of palettes for a subdivision and there is only so much you can do with those tones. He suggested that trying to take 16 colors and attempt to create more diversity would be more of a challenge than is really necessary. He said he is in support of the color palettes that they have and thinks there is enough roof material changes and colors in the design.

Chair Sippel asked Planner Temes if she had received enough feedback from the Commission.

Planner Temes summarized that she felt she had received support for some of the comments that Staff had made. She asked if she could suggest that they shift two or three color palettes around a little bit to get some colors that are more in keeping with the architectural style for the designs that weren't. She stated that they would work with the applicant to improve the designs a bit in terms of color. She also indicated that they would work with the applicant on the rear elevations to articulate them a little further. She said they would also suggest adding a few architectural features to the front that are appropriate to the architectural style. She thanked the Commission for their feedback.

2. DR17-1037, AMERICAN GROVES SENIOR LIVING: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, COLORS AND MATERIALS, AND LIGHTING FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.48 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF ELLIOT ROAD AND 29TH PLACE AND ZONED SINGLE FAMILY-35 (SF-35).

Planner Gilbert Olgin began his presentation on DR17-1037. He told the Commission that this case was American Groves Senior Living, noting that this was the 4th application that had been before the Planning Commission. He said they would focus on the site plan, landscaping and the building elevations. He shared the location of the property at the southeast corner of Elliot Road and 29th Place.

Comment: Chair Sippel asked that Planner Olgin only provide the Commission with new information.

Planner Olgin continued his presentation. He shared the site plan, noting the arrows that indicated the two major points of ingress and egress. He also pointed out that the starred area indicated the location of gates for fire access. He also showed the location of the parking stalls and the trash enclosures. He shared that there would be two different buildings on the site. One of the buildings would be a two-story building at the front of the site, and the second building would be a one-story building in the back. He stated that this design is a result of comments from the public expressing concern about the two-story structure being located in the back. The applicant then located the two-story building closer to the high school. He called attention to the proposed parking garages. He shared that the proposed facility called for 86 units to be used for an Independent Living/Assisted Living facility. He revealed that the project would have studio, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units. He said they would also have full restrooms and kitchenettes,

as well as interior common areas. He stated that they also would have amenities which include a swimming pool, open space with garden areas, and walkways around the entire site.

He shared the building elevations and shared that the architecture was designed to fit in with the 1-acre lots that surround the property. Staff thinks they did a good job in trying to make it fit in, but he noted that the rendering didn't do the design justice. He briefly discussed the asphalt shingle tiles being proposed in the design. He shared the roof plan, noting the location of the proposed asphalt shingles. He indicated that it says in the design guidelines, that Staff doesn't support the use of asphalt shingles. However, Staff contends that these shingles are not the same type that is often seen on a residential home. He said they believe these shingles would help support the look and would not present any type of downgraded look. He asked the Commission for input regarding the use of the asphalt shingles. He then discussed the six proposed garages. He stated that the garages would have the same type of architecture and would be six separate buildings that stand on their own. He indicated that the overall site has 66 parking spaces, which is more than is required and pointed out that they have plenty of room for these separate garages. He pointed out that the garages would be an added feature or amenity for the residents living there. He shared the Landscape Plan noting the use of several types of trees that they thought would help the design fit in with the neighborhood: Desert Willow, Sissoo, Red Push Pistache and the Southern Live Oak. He noted that they tried to use some of the larger types of trees to go along 29th Place and along Elliot Road to help with the noise that these roadways create. He briefly discussed grading and drainage and site lighting.

Chair Sippel thanked Gilbert Olgin for his presentation and called for questions or comments.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler commended the applicant for the excellent design. He pointed out that they have done a project once before in the Town and they did a great job with that project. He hopes they can continue at that level of quality and from what he sees in this design, he believes they have done so. Regarding the garages, he said he likes the detail they put into the design on the street facing side. He asked about the emergency loop that goes through the back and if there was an emergency gate provided.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered that there is an emergency gate. He said he believes it is a Knox-Box.

Gilbert Olgin shared with the Commission that the applicant had made a last minute change on the design of the garages, so he passed out a copy of the garage elevations. He said the difference involved an awning cover that would connect the garages.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler acknowledged that he could see the change in design. He also noted that the rendering showed a veneered stone wall, but he said that didn't show on the rendering in front of them. He asked if they were still building the 3' wall.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said they were still building the 3' wall.

Question: David Cavenee asked to see the roof and mentioned the possibility of using asphalt shingles. He asked Planner Olgin to confirm what kind of material they used in their other project, The Orchards.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered that they had used a concrete tile on their other facility.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the applicant was pushing towards the use of asphalt shingles or if Staff had requested the use of the asphalt shingles.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin responded that the applicant would like to use asphalt shingles.

Comment: David Cavenee stated that he believed that asphalt shingles can look nice. He said this elevation has a lot of exposed roof and he believes the concrete tile looks a little nicer and has a cleaner look. He indicated that he is struggling with the use of the asphalt shingle for that much roof elevation. When he thinks about the other facility, which he finds to be very attractive and he thinks fits in well with the community, he suggested encouraging the applicant toward concrete tile as a material. He shared that he was anxious to hear the comments of the other Commissioners.

Comment: Chair Sippel revealed that he agreed with Commissioner Cavenee and indicated that he would like to hear how the other Commissioners feel about the use of the asphalt shingles as opposed to the concrete tile.

Question: Brian Johns asked if they were an architectural style asphalt shingle.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin showed an example of the type of shingle they were proposing on the screen.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns noted that there are different levels of asphalt shingles. He stated that one of the higher levels of asphalt shingles could look nice. He said that in the packet, it is showing a round tab asphalt shingle, but the one being shown tonight is a square. He asked which one they were proposing.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin revealed that in response to the concerns, the applicant was proposing the square one that he was displaying on the screen.

Question: Chair Sippel asked to clarify who had expressed concern. He asked if the concern was Staff-generated.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin suggested that Staff had a concern about the use of the asphalt shingle and the applicant responded with this type of asphalt shingle. He revealed that the sample proposed was not typical of an asphalt shingle typically used on a residential home.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns stated that he would like to hear other opinions from the Commissioners. He stated that this was a lot of roof and it was very high up. He mentioned that it wasn't at a ground level like they are used to seeing. He pointed out that it is very high pitched and since it is such a strong pitch, it wouldn't take the concrete tile as easily as another design with a flatter pitch would. He asked Planner Olgin if it was a design requirement or an ordinance that wouldn't allow the use of the asphalt shingle.

Answer: Planning Manager Linda Edwards responded that the Design Guidelines are guidelines in place to help ensure that they bring in the highest quality design they can, but she pointed out that the Design Guidelines are not standards or Code. She said in this instance, Staff believes that high quality asphalt shingles would fit the architecture and the pitches on the roof. She also

suggested that they keep in mind that the one-story on the southern end of the project is deliberately dropped so that it ties in better with the community. She pointed out that Staff is not opposing the shingles, but it is at the Commission's purview to agree to their use or not.

Comment: Brian Johns thanked Linda Edwards for her clarification. He mentioned that he thinks the applicant is using a lot of nice materials and going beyond the normal stucco boxes they are used to seeing. He shared that he appreciated that. He stated that he isn't totally opposed to the asphalt shingles, but he agrees that it brings a little bit different level of quality to the project. He mentioned that he drives by The Orchard's every day and thinks it is a very nice looking project. He suggested that he is on the fence about the use of the shingles, and would like further input from the other Commissioners. Regarding the garages, he shared that he wasn't opposed to the garages at all. He thought they had done a wonderful job in providing the garages. He suggested that the garages kind of soften up the parking and instead of a sea of parking, the garages will break the parking area up. He said if anything, he is surprised that they didn't choose to build more garages. He stated that it will be a great amenity for the clientele. He also mentioned that he thought they had done a wonderful job with the colors. He further shared that he thought the building had a very humanistic scale to it. He stated that he appreciates the fact that the applicant has taken into consideration the concerns of the neighboring residents.

Comment: David Cavenee stated that he liked Commissioner Johns' point about the slope of the roof being fairly steep and the roof being up high. He revealed that he didn't think it necessary to mandate that they use concrete tile. He articulated that this was just his opinion. He noted that because it is up so high, the visual appearance will lose any articulation that the shingle has because it is so high. He said he stands by his perspective that it would look better to use concrete tile.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield revealed that he didn't have an opinion on the roof material. He said he believes that as high as it is and as masked as it is, it is going to get lost up there, no matter what material is used. He acknowledged that this wasn't his area of expertise, so he thought the asphalt shingles would be fine and he would concur with Staff on that.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler pointed out that he didn't have a problem with the use of asphalt shingles, but he noted that it is a lot of roof. He mentioned that there are multiple architectural styles of asphalt shingles and he thought it would be good to have the applicant come back with one of the higher quality asphalt shingles. He said there are some that are 2- and 3-ply and give a bigger shadow line. If the applicant could come back with an offering that would bring more depth to the design, he would prefer it and it would create some more interest in the roof. He asked to see one of the slides that showed the design and asked if all the light gray showing on the elevation was metal and if all the dark gray showing was asphalt.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered affirmatively.

Comment: Joshua Oehler stated that he thought the mix of metal and asphalt would provide a good mixture. Regarding the 1-story building, he said they would look better with an asphalt shingle, but he just recommended a bit more depth on the asphalt shingle itself. He suggested

that he thought the actually term might be 2- or 3-ply, but indicated that the kind he was referring to had more cuts to it and gives a bigger shadow line, bringing more interest to the roof.

Comment: Gregory Froehlich indicated that he didn't have a roof opinion. However, he mentioned that he wanted to bring up something on the east side of the property. He pointed out that there is an existing brick wall that is likely owned by the high school. He thought it looked to be about 4' to 5' in height. He stated that he wanted to make sure they were doing enough on the site to deter high school students parking in the lot and hopping over the fence. He also said they had a nice area for putting, but he pointed out that they might want to take their putters and hop the wall and play on the grass. He suggested having something to deter that. He mentioned that he had seen some detail for a trellis and suggested the possibility of putting that trellis near the wall to make more of an obstacle.

Chair Sippel asked if Vice Chair Andersen wanted to weigh in on the roof material.

Comment: Vice Chair Andersen said he thought the consensus was that the asphalt shingles were an acceptable choice, so he was in agreement with that.

Comment: Chair Sippel suggested that they would follow Staff's recommendation on the use of the shingles, but did say they might suggest a thicker ply like Commissioner Oehler had suggested.

Question: Gilbert Olgin asked if the Commission had any concerns regarding the garages.

Answer: Chair Sippel indicated that they did not.

3. DR17-1040, CENTRAL ARIZONA SUPPLY / POTATO BARN: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.93 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED WEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF S. RECKER ROAD AND E. WILLIAMS ROAD AND ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC).

Bob Caravona began his presentation on DR17-1040. He stated that he believes this is the right use at the right location and the right architecture. He mentioned he is very excited about the project because this is a site that has sat vacant for a number of years. He requested input from the Commission on the architecture, specifically the use of metal, and the north and south elevation of Building C. He shared an aerial photo, noting that the property is zoned General Commercial (GC). He revealed that south of the subject site is the railroad tracks. He said the site has an existing building which is the former Potato Barn building. There is also an existing blue awning structure on the site. He shared that the site constraints facing this property are significant. There is a 50' wide underground natural gas supply pipeline easement along the eastern property line, and a retention basin easement, as well as a non-conforming billboard on the site. This leaves a smaller building site for available building. He noted that the applicant is meeting development standards and requirements. He indicated that the applicant plans to make

this a phased development. Phase 1 would consist of the Central Arizona Supply building (Building C) and Phase 1a would be developed after they find some retail tenants. Phase 1a would consist of a retail/restaurant building. He revealed that with the plan to develop Phase 2, they would be required to construct a western ingress/egress travel aisle and additional parking during Phase 1. He stated that the applicant is submitting for deferred parking. He said this tenant constitutes a special use. The Central Arizona Supply Building is a retailer/wholesaler of plumbing fixtures and heating and air conditioning components. He shared that approximately 3,500 to 4,000 square feet is display, and the rest of the building is storage and supply. He said the business doesn't have as much demand as a traditional retailer would. He indicated that they anticipate approximately 3-4 customers per hour. He revealed that they are meeting parking requirements for Phase 1. He shared the Landscape Plan, noting the location of the underground gas easement. He mentioned that according to El Paso Gas, they are not allowed to have deep-rooted trees and shrubs. Due to this constraint, Staff is working with the applicant to find appropriate materials that they can use. He shared the elevations. He indicated that the design uses metal and is the type of design you would expect to find next to a railroad. He said the design lends to the past, but also into the future. He specifically asked about the south elevation of Building D that faced the Central Arizona Supply building. He shared that it was interior to the site and wouldn't be visible to the public. He suggested that he believes the design is adequate, but that the applicant probably could have done more. However, he pointed out that if they did something more, it would probably defeat the purpose of the architecture. He shared the elevation that you would see from the roadway. He stated that he felt it was a very unique design. He then shared the east elevation. He revealed that East 172nd is not being proposed at this time, but noted that it is part of the adjacent property owners and is not part of this development. He again reminded the Commission that trees would not be allowed in the easement. He shared the architectural materials and pointed out that he had made an error in his Staff Report in referring to the metal as corrugated metal, when it is actually standing seam metal.

Chair Sippel thanked Planner Caravona for his presentation and called for questions or comments.

Question: David Cavenee asked to see the site plan. He said that in his packet he was seeing an emergency loop road. He asked if that was still there and if it went through the easement. He also asked if it would be gated off.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered affirmatively that there was an emergency loop.

Question: David Cavenee mentioned that he thought he had heard Planner Caravona say there wouldn't be any trees in the easement, but he noted that he sees trees in the rendering.

Answer: Bob Caravona acknowledged that they would not be able to have the trees in that area.

Question: David Cavenee asked if, when 172nd came in, if there would be an effort to punch through and try and provide access to and from.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered that there is the potential to extend it through at two potential access points.

Comment: David Cavenee pointed out that he loved the architecture. He stated that he thought the materials were fine and he likes the metal. Regarding the south elevation, he said because it wasn't facing the street and was internal to the site, he had no problem with it and didn't think it needed to be any fancier than it is.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield revealed that he thought this was a great project. He mentioned that he was impressed and pleased by what the applicant was putting forward for this project. He pointed out that the site is an old and tired spot and this will revitalize it. He articulated that he likes the architecture and has no concerns about what is being proposed. He said that Commissioner Cavenee had addressed Bob Caravona's specific questions the same way that he would have.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler revealed that he thought the architecture looked good, but he had a few questions regarding the site. He asked if the emergency road would have a gate on it. Answer: Bob Caravona answered that it would not have a gate.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said he was wondering since it would create a dead end if there was a gate. He asked if the public would be able to go around the loop.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered that they would be able, but he mentioned that the area isn't intended to be driven through.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said he found it interesting because normally you wouldn't see that type of space in a landscape setback, because normally you wouldn't be allowed to have that kind of drive. He asked if it was okay to be in the landscape setback since it is technically a drive.

Answer: Bob Caravona indicated that it was actually outside the setback.

Question: Joshua Oehler mentioned that on the architectural site plan, it shows an open courtyard, but on the landscape plan, it shows landscape in the same area. He asked which was correct.

Answer: Bob Caravona said he presumes that the site plan is correct, and he will make the revision on the landscape plan.

Question: Joshua Oehler called attention to an area on the south side in the front. He noted that it looks like one spot has two trees at the southwest corner of the building. He said it seemed a little awkward to have two trees in that location. He pointed out that there is one parking spot between the two trees. He asked if it was a loading zone.

Answer: Bob Caravona responded that they were probably counting the spaces.

Comment: Joshua Oehler just wanted to make sure that they weren't forcing them into having the one space like that.

Response: Bob Caravona answered that he wasn't aware of any Staff comment regarding the space in question.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked when Phase 1a comes in, if there is any ADA parking for that building.

Answer: Bob Caravona noted that it was across from the building.

Comment: Joshua Oehler pointed out that you can't go across a drive aisle for ADA parking. He stated that he wanted to make sure they caught that when it was easier to address.

Chair Sippel asked if there were any further comments or questions.

Comment/Question: Greg Froehlich shared that he thought they were very nice buildings. He stated that he had a question in regards to Phase 2. He asked if there were plans to renovate the existing building during Phase 2.

Answer: Bob Caravona responded that at this time, there are no plans to renovate the building immediately. They would need to find a user for it first.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns stated that he agreed with the previous Commissioner regarding the ADA access. He also agreed that it was kind of odd that the road went into the back. He asked if that was a Town requirement.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered that it was a Town requirement for fire and also for trash.

Question: Brian Johns asked if they couldn't have done the loop from the bottom.

Answer: Bob Caravona asked to clarify that he meant a hammerhead.

Comment: Brian Johns said he thought a hammerhead could have been used.

Response: Bob Caravona responded that they were tight on spaces at the location, but they could take a look into that possibility.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns stated that he likes circulation, but he doesn't like a lot of asphalt. He suggested that it might be something they could look at, if the applicant was willing. He shared that he liked the architecture and the materials. He mentioned that it was a very fun building and he thought they had put a lot of effort and design into it. He asked what Planner Caravona had been referring to regarding the offset metal roof.

Answer: Bob Caravona stated that he was referring to the mass of metal. In the guidelines, it says a design should not have a predominate amount of metal panels or corrugated metal. He said when he looks at the entire mass of the elevation, it was approaching over 50%. However, he shared that they have used a different type of metal in a couple of places, but he just wanted feedback that the Commission didn't think too much metal had been used or if a different material could have been used. Planner Caravona said that after looking at the 19 different color board materials, he felt it was acceptable.

Comment: Brian Johns pointed out that they had used a lot of materials. He noted that the mass was one of the fun parts of the building. He thought it was quite attractive and had no issue with it. He said it brings interest and is better than a square box. He said it will create a really unique space inside. He shared that he loves the use of the metal throughout the whole project. He also noted that they had brought in a lot of masonry.

Chair Sippel told Planner Caravona that he didn't know if the applicant was present at tonight's meeting, but he wanted to make sure that Planner Caravona passed on his appreciation for the design. He indicated that he thought they had done a phenomenal job with the design. Noting that they were in attendance, Chair Sippel directly told the applicants that they had done a great job. He told the applicant that he thought they had captured Gilbert well, especially in a historic site.

At this point, Chair Sippel stated that he would be recessing the Study Session so that they could begin the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission. With that in mind, he said he would skip to Item #6 on the agenda.

6. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda

Chair Sippel mentioned that there had been some discussion about moving Item #14 to the Consent Agenda, but it had been determined that Item #14 should stay on the Non-Consent Agenda. He asked if anyone else had any changes to make to the Regular Meeting Agenda.

Seeing no other changes to the agenda, Chair Sippel recessed the Study Session at 6:10 p.m.

Chair Sippel called the Study Session back to order at 6:57 p.m.

4. DR17-1049, BILL LUKE AUTO DEALERSHIP: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR AN APPROXIMATELY 24,000 SF AUTOMOTIVE RETAIL DEALERSHIP AND A 64,000 SF VEHICLE RE-CONDITIONING FACILITY, LOCATED ON APPROXIMATELY 14 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF VAL VISTA DRIVE AND PECOS ROAD AND ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Nichole McCarty began her presentation on DR17-1049. She shared that this project was for Bill Luke Auto Dealership. She said this was a Design Review case. She shared the location of the property southwest of the southwest corner of Pecos Road and Val Vista Drive. She revealed that it is within an existing Motorplex complex. She shared that the site is zoned General Commercial (GC) and is a 14-acre site. She said it is adjacent to a mix of uses, both residential and County Island, as well as other General Commercial zoning. She shared a project overview, noting that the site is divided into two sites, the northern portion which is a 64,000 square foot reconditioning facility. She stated that this facility is not open to the public. The southern portion will house a 24,000 square foot retail automotive dealership that is open to the public. She shared the Landscape Plan, noting that the site landscaping is over the 15% minimum. She pointed out that because it is an automobile dealership, they have ample automobile spaces, 192 of which are allocated for employee and customer parking. 602 of the spaces are allocated for inventory and display spaces. She shared the site plan, indicating the two different uses on the

different portions of the site. She pointed out that the Reconditioning Facility would not just be used for the vehicles at this dealership, but for all their other dealerships in the valley. The vehicles will be transported on trucks and come into the site at the location of the guard shack. She noted that they will load up from vehicle staging areas and exit the site. She mentioned that the entire site is screened by a 7' solid wall. She shared the location of the employee parking along the west side. She indicated that there is an emergency fire access gate through the middle of the site. She stated that there is also a 3' screening wall along the employee parking area. She shared that the southern portion of the site is the automotive dealership area. She said that the main access road for the auto dealership is off of Speedway Drive. She indicated a pedestrian access point leading from the front of the dealership out to the street.

Planner McCarty shared a 3-D Aerial Rendering that showed the location of the buildings on the site. She further discussed the Landscape Plan, pointing out that the applicant is meeting their minimums, but she indicated that they have an additional Code requirement that within the lot, 10% of the interior lot area has to be landscaped. She pointed out that it is always difficult for a car dealership to give up the space to meet this requirement. She shared that she is asking as part of 2nd Review that they show that they are meeting the landscape requirements within the interior lot area. She said they are introducing five different trees, some of which are shade trees, and a variety of shrubs and ground cover. She shared an aerial view color rendering of the site. She shared the floor plan for the retail building. She pointed out that this building didn't have a Service Center, but would just have a Sales Office and Showroom, as well as a breakroom for the employees. She shared the floor plan for the Reconditioning Facility. She indicated the location where the cars would be worked on. She shared the building elevations. She mentioned that the East Elevation had the main entrance and it also has a large covered canopy that extends outward. She shared that the building height is 24' and the main entry goes up to 28'4". She stated that they also had some accessory buildings consisting of a car wash and a guard shack. She indicated that they match in terms of materials used. She briefly discussed the colors and materials. She said there is ample site lighting because it is a car dealership. Planner McCarty stated that the customer parking was covered parking. She noted that Staff didn't have any major concerns with the project, but they have made some suggestions about breaking up the mass in some of the accessory buildings. She asked for feedback from the Commission regarding the architecture.

Question: David Cavenee asked if he could see the aerial view. He asked her to zoom in and show him where the 7' screen wall is located and where the 3' wall is located.

Answer: Planner McCarty showed the location of both the 3' and 7' wall.

Question: David Cavenee asked if there was any kind of screening wall around the retail portion.

Answer: Nichole McCarty responded that she couldn't see at this level on the site plan, but she said she could verify that.

Comment: David Cavenee stated that he realized car dealerships don't like to have that look, but he said he hoped that it looks consistent and that the rest of the materials are consistent. He

noted that it appeared that the 3' and the 7' wall seem consistent in materials and in look and feel.

Response: Nichole McCarty said that they definitely were consistent.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that the main entrance into the retail was off of Speedway Drive.

Answer: Nichole McCarty answered affirmatively.

Comment: David Cavenee stated that he thought it looked like a car dealership. He had no specific concerns and felt it had enough articulation in the vertical face and that it was broken up adequately. He said he sees some shadowing that creates some variation and it isn't just one flat wall. He noted that the entries are highlighted and it appears they have some green screen on the back to soften that and add some texture. He said he had no concerns with the elevations and he thought the auxiliary buildings fit nicely because they have tried to finish them in a way that's identical to the other buildings.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked for clarification about the 7' wall. He asked if there was landscape and also asked if there was display in front of the wall.

Answer: Nichole McCarty clarified that the landscaping is on the outside of the walls and she showed the location of the wall, noting that there would be ample setbacks before you would see the wall.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked if there was an internal 7' wall between the two uses.

Answer: Nichole McCarty answered affirmatively.

Comment: Joshua Oehler sought to clarify that the public wouldn't really be seeing the buildings that much if there is a 7' wall.

Response: Nichole McCarty responded that Commissioner Oehler was correct. The ancillary buildings are approximately 17' tall and they will be right up against the wall, so the public would see the rear of the ancillary buildings. She offered to show the rear of those buildings if he desired to see them.

Response: Joshua Oehler stated that he didn't need to see them. He said he thought they were small enough buildings that he didn't think it was too important to have a lot of movement, especially since they were already losing the base to public view, which already makes them look more utilitarian.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said he agrees that the building looks like a car dealership. He said it doesn't give any major splash, but it looks like a car dealership and it is one, so it is achieving what the building is supposed to be. Overall, he thought they have created a look for it by breaking up the different pieces of the building. Regarding the interior landscape, he indicated that he understands the 10% requirement, but he asked if it was an option to do a larger piece in one area, so they don't have to have islands everywhere.

Answer: Nichole McCarty responded that is what Staff suggests with car dealerships. She said they definitely have room around the site and in other areas for the landscaping. She pointed out that they are willing to help the applicant be creative in how they meet their requirements.

Comment: Brian Johns agreed that it does look like a car dealership, but he mentioned that he thought the colors were a little monotone. He said he didn't know if they had the actual color board there tonight.

Response: Nichole McCarty apologized that she hadn't brought it over tonight, but said she could present it at the public hearing.

Comment: Brian Johns said he didn't know how Staff feels about the colors, but he stated that throughout the entire Motorplex, most of the buildings have an element that pops. He mentioned that he appreciates that they are using some of the composite metal material on the tower in the front, but he suggested that it isn't a very exciting tower. He suggested a little more articulation in the tower area. He stated that the front of the design is basically a box. He said the sides of the design actually have more excitement than the front does. He shared that if Staff is okay with the design, he doesn't need to push anything further, but he thought that it just kind of sits there and doesn't pop like the dealerships in the neighboring facilities.

Question: Brian Johns asked about the landscaping behind a 7' wall. He said he understands that they want 10% back there, but he stated that he doesn't think it makes sense business wise. He said he would like to hear what the other Commissioners think about that. He said if it is a requirement that Staff is pushing for, then maybe the Commission can give guidance on it.

Answer: Nichole McCarty said that Staff's intent would be to encourage that the landscape in the public areas are meeting the 10% and not in the back area.

Comment: Brian Johns stated that he thought there had to be 10% in the back area. He said he agrees that there needs to be 10% in the public areas and in any area with a street side view.

Response: Nichole McCarty responded that they do require some landscaping in the back, because there are employees back there and they don't just want barren land, but the 10% is focused on the public area.

Comment: Brian Johns said he appreciated the clarification. He said he had thought they were pushing for more, and he feels that since it is just a workforce area, he doesn't feel it needs a lot of landscape. He thanked Nichole McCarty for her clarification.

Comment: Joshua Oehler stated that he didn't have anything further to add, but he thought Staff should be flexible with the way in which they move the landscaping around. He said he agrees they should still have it, but try and push it into areas where it can be seen. He thought the majority of the required percentage should be in the public space.

Chair Sippel thanked Nichole McCarty for her presentation. He then called the next case.

5. DR17-1050, RUDY'S RESTAURANT AND COUNTRY STORE: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, COLORS AND MATERIALS, AND LIGHTING FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.79 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF

HIGLEY AND BASELINE ROADS, AND ZONED REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (RC).

Bob Caravona began his presentation on DR17-1050, Rudy's Restaurant and Country Store. He indicated that this was a Design Review. He asked for input from the Commission on the use of red as a predominant color in the design. He said the applicant had done a great job since the pre-application to subdue the red and make it less predominant in the design. He said this is the third submittal of the design. He stated that the applicant had also provided a recent update and he will be showing a side-by-side comparison to show the improvements they have made to the design. He shared the location of the site at the northeast corner of Higley and Baseline. He reminded the Commission that there had been an approval for three buildings of a modern contemporary design. He shared that this request is that Buildings 2 and 3 be eliminated and that they be replaced with Rudy's. He indicated that they will also be reconfiguring the parking lot associated with Rudy's. He mentioned that they have been resolving some of the issues with parking in terms of counts and regarding a shared parking easement between what is now Building 1 and Rudy's. He said they are meeting with the Master Developer's Attorney to get this resolved. He stated that the proposal meets the development standards. He shared that the building height is 25'. He shared that they have submitted a revised landscaping plan and they wanted to show that the perimeter landscaping had been previously approved, so the request is for the interior landscaping. He shared some development context for the area around the site. To the north, is a proposed Cracker Barrel and to the south is a restaurant and retail usage. A Starbucks and a Popeye's are currently in Administrative Design Review. He also shared that across the street from this project is the City Gate Marketplace. Planner Caravona said that the guidelines say that the primary color should not be the predominant use. He showed the four elevations as they were showing in the Commissioner's packets and he indicated that on the right were the revised elevations that were just submitted on Monday of this week. He revealed that the applicant has responded to Staff's comments to look at the opportunities to change what was previously red underneath the shed roof, to brown, and they have done this in other areas as well. They also have made the transition on the southeast corner to all brown, as well as on the northeast. He complimented the applicant on their four-sided architecture. He shared the location of the smoke room that is hidden behind a recessed wall. He stated that the mechanicals associated with the barbeque are also present, but they are hidden. He also pointed out the use of corrugated metal on the shed roof. Bob Caravona finished his presentation and asked for any recommendations.

Comment: David Cavenee noted that the one thing he likes about the architecture of restaurants is that they are eclectic and unique. He shared that they exhibit what you would expect to experience inside. With that said, he stated that he doesn't mind the red and he thinks the red tells the story of what someone is going to experience, noting that it will create a cool street frontage against the other restaurants in the area, each with their own iconic colors and look and feel. He indicated that in mixed-use developments he has done in the past, they wanted the restaurants to be very unique and creative so that they would stand out as something special. He pointed out that he thought this would be a nice Higley Road frontage and he appreciates that they have tempered the red just a little bit in some of the corners. He said he thought that was a positive and he appreciated them working with Staff to do so. He suggested that there is a lot of

interest to the elevation and he doesn't think there is a bland side to it. He said he doesn't have any additional recommendations because he thinks it looks good.

Comment: Brian Johns said he agrees. He stated that he wanted to thank Planner Caravona for the side by side comparison. He said he really appreciates that. He thinks this will be a nice addition and they took into consideration the areas around it. He also likes the four-sided architecture. He shared that he thinks the design is very well done.

Question: Brian Johns asked about the screening of the smokestacks.

Answer: Bob Caravona showed the smokestacks, noting that they would still be visible, but that they were shielded somewhat.

Comment: Brian Johns said that he wouldn't want the smokestacks completely screened. He thinks that you want to see those at a barbeque place. He doesn't think of them as mechanicals, but more as a chimney.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield thanked Bob Caravona for a nice presentation. He mentioned that he is excited to have a Rudy's in Gilbert. He said that it sounds like the Commissioners would have allowed more red in the design, because the design should stand out and be unique. He stated that this area has had a tremendous amount of interest and is going to have a lot of diversity. He said it might even become another Downtown Gilbert.

Chair Sippel thanked the applicant for being here tonight. He said that he agreed with Commissioner Bloomfield that the area is becoming quite fun and will be a very desirable area. He said he appreciated the work they had done.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Chair Sippel adjourned the Study Session at 7:26 p.m. Chair Sippel thanked the Staff for staying late to present.

Kristofer Sippel, Chairman

ATTEST:

Debbie Frazey, Recording Secretary